



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,471	10/16/2003	Xing Xie	MSI-1643US	3070
<div>22801 7590 01/17/2008</div> <div>LEE & HAYES PLLC</div> <div>421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500</div> <div>SPOKANE, WA 99201</div>				
			<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>DALEY, CLIFTON G</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>2624</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE</div> <div>01/17/2008</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/688,471

Applicant(s)

XIE ET AL.

Examiner

Clifton G. Daley

Art Unit

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Clifton G. Daley.

(3) Robert Hartman.

(2) Samir Ahmed.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 12 and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Horvitz et al. (US 6232974), Itti et al. (Computational Modelling of Visual Attention), Osberger (US 6670963) and Pirolli (Exploring Browser Design Trade-offs Using a Dynamical Model of Optimal Information Foraging).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants proposed amendment to claim 1 overcomes cited references of Horvitz and Itti. Osberger may read on amendment, but additional search will be required. Regarding claims 12 and 13, it was agreed that Pirolli did not disclose "information fidelity". However, there was disagreement on whether or not the cited references as a whole read on the claims. Applicant will present arguments in amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required